

Extremal decomposition problems in the Euclidean space

K.A. Gulyaeva¹, S.I. Kalmykov², E.G. Prilepkina³

Abstract

Composition principles for reduced moduli are extended to the case of domains in the n -dimensional Euclidean space, $n > 2$. As a consequence analogues of extremal decomposition theorems of Kufarev, Dubinin and Kirillova in the planer case are obtained.

Subject Classification: 31B99

Keywords: reduced modulus, Robin function, Neumann function, nonoverlapping domain, extremal decomposition problem.

1 Introduction and notations

Extremal decomposition problems have a rich history and go back to M.A. Lavrentiev's inequality for the product of conformal radii of non-overlapping domains. There exist two methods of their study: the extremal-metric method and the capacitive method. The first one has been systematically developed in papers by G.V. Kuz'mina, E.G. Emel'yanov, A.Yu. Solynin, A. Vasil'ev, and Ch. Pommerenke [9, 14, 6, 11]. The second approach is developed mainly in works of V.N. Dubinin and his students [4, 5, 2, 3]. In particular, a series of well-known results about extremal decomposition follows one way from composition principles for generalized reduced moduli (see [1, p. 56] and [12]). In the present paper we extend the mentioned composition principles to the case of spatial domains. As a consequence we get theorem about extremal decomposition for the harmonic radius [7] obtained earlier in [5].

Throughout the paper, $\mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the n -dimensional Euclidean space consisting of points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $n \geq 3$, and $|x| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2}$ is the length of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} B(a, r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |a - x| < r\}, \\ S(a, r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |a - x| = r\}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^n; \end{aligned}$$

¹Far Eastern Federal University, Vladivostok, Russia, kgulyayeva@gmail.com

²Far Eastern Federal University, Vladivostok, Russia, Institute of Applied Mathematics, Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok, Russia, sergeykalmykov@inbox.ru

³Far Eastern Federal University, Vladivostok, Russia, Institute of Applied Mathematics, Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok, Russia, prilelena@yandex.ru

$\omega_{n-1} = 2\pi^{n/2}/\Gamma(n/2)$ is the area of the unit sphere $S(0, 1)$;

$\lambda_n = ((n-2)\omega_{n-1})^{-1}$.

D is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Γ is a closed subset of ∂D . The pair (D, Γ) is admissible if there exists the Robin function, $g_\Gamma(z, z_0, D)$ harmonic in $D \setminus \{z_0\}$, continuous in $\overline{D} \setminus \{z_0\}$ and

$$\frac{\partial g_\Gamma}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } (\partial D) \setminus \Gamma, \quad (1)$$

$$g_\Gamma = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma, \quad (2)$$

and in a neighborhood of z_0 there is an expansion

$$g_\Gamma(z, z_0, D) = \lambda_n (|z - z_0|^{2-n} - r(D, z_0, \Gamma)^{2-n} + o(1)), \quad z \rightarrow z_0, \quad (3)$$

where $\partial/\partial n$ means the inward normal derivative on the boundary. In what follows all such pairs are assumed to be admissible.

In the case $\Gamma = \emptyset$ we change the condition (1) by the condition

$$\frac{\partial g_\Gamma}{\partial n} = \frac{1}{\mu_{n-1}(\partial D)} \text{ on } \partial D,$$

where $\mu_{n-1}(\partial D)$ is the area of boundary.

By analogy with the definition of the Robin radius for plain domains from the paper [3] we will call the constant $r(D, z_0, \Gamma)$ the Robin radius of the domain D and the set Γ . Note that in the case of $\Gamma = \partial D$ we get the harmonic radius [7, 10, 5].

Let $\Delta = \{\delta_k\}_k^m$ be a collection of real numbers and $Z = \{z_k\}_{k=1}^m$ be points of the domain D . For $\Gamma = \emptyset$ we additionally require

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k = 0.$$

Define the potential function for the domain D , the set Γ , the collection of points Z , and numbers Δ :

$$u(z) = u(z; Z, D, \Gamma, \Delta) = \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k g_\Gamma(z, z_k, D).$$

Note that for $\Gamma = \emptyset$ the function $g_\Gamma(z, z_k, D)$ is defined up to an additive constant. Nevertheless, the function $u(z)$ is defined uniquely and characterized by the condition

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial D.$$

It is clear from the definition of the potential function that in a neighborhood of z_k we have

$$u(z) = \delta_k \lambda_n |z - z_k|^{2-n} + a_k + o(1), \quad k = 1, \dots, m,$$

where

$$a_k = -\delta_k \lambda_n r(D, z_k, \Gamma)^{2-n} + \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \delta_l g_\Gamma(z_l, z_k, D).$$

Now if we introduce the following notation

$$g_\Gamma(z_k, z_k, D) = -\lambda_n r(D, z_k, \Gamma)^{2-n},$$

then the constant in the expansion of the potential function in a neighbourhood of z_k is

$$a_k = \sum_{l=1}^m \delta_l g_\Gamma(z_l, z_k, D). \quad (4)$$

A function $v(z)$ is admissible for D , Z , Δ , and Γ if $v(z) \in \text{Lip}$ in a neighbourhood of each point of D except maybe finitely many such points, continuous in $\overline{D} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m \{z_k\}$, $v(z) = 0$ on Γ , and in neighbourhood of z_k there is an expansion

$$v(z) = \delta_k \lambda_n |z - z_k|^{2-n} + b_k + o(1), \quad z \rightarrow z_k. \quad (5)$$

The Dirichlet integral is the following

$$I(f, D) = \int_D |\nabla f|^2 d\mu,$$

where $d\mu = dx_1 \dots dx_n$.

2 Main results

Lemma 2.1 *The asymptotic formula*

$$I(u, D_r) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k^2 \right) \lambda_n r^{2-n} + \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k a_k + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0,$$

is true, where u is the potential function and a_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$ are defined in (4) and $D_r = D \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m B(z_k, r)$.

Proof. The Green's identity

$$\int_V |\nabla u|^2 d\mu = - \int_{\partial V} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds$$

gives

$$I(u, D_r) = - \int_{\partial D_r} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds = - \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{S(z_k, r)} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds. \quad (6)$$

The second equality in (6) holds because $u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0$ on ∂D . Note that

$$u = \delta_k \lambda_n r^{2-n} + a_k + o(1), \quad z \rightarrow z_k$$

in a neighbourhood of z_k .

We calculate the integral $\int_{S(z_k, r)} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds$. Let $u(z) = h(z) + g(z)$, where $h(z) = \lambda_n \delta_k |z - z_k|^{2-n}$ and $g(z)$ is a harmonic function. Note that $g(z_k) = a_k$. For $|z - z_k| = r$ we have the following correlations

$$\begin{aligned} r^{n-1} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} &= r^{n-1} \left(h \frac{\partial h}{\partial n} + h \frac{\partial g}{\partial n} + g \frac{\partial h}{\partial n} + g \frac{\partial g}{\partial n} \right) \\ &= (2-n) \lambda_n^2 \delta_k^2 r^{2-n} + r \lambda_n \delta_k \frac{\partial g}{\partial n} + (2-n) g \lambda_n \delta_k + g \frac{\partial g}{\partial n} r^{n-1} \\ &= - \frac{\lambda_n \delta_k^2}{\omega_{n-1}} r^{2-n} - \frac{g(z_k) \delta_k}{\omega_{n-1}} + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S(z_k, r)} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds &= \int_{S(0,1)} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} r^{n-1} ds \\ &= - \lambda_n \delta_k^2 r^{2-n} - \delta_k a_k + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting it in (6) we get the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 2.2 *For an admissible function v and the potential function u we have*

$$I(v - u, D_r) = I(v, D_r) - I(u, D_r) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k (b_k - a_k) + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. One may observe that

$$\begin{aligned} I(v - u, D_r) &= \int_{D_r} (|\nabla v|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 - 2 \nabla u \nabla v) d\mu \\ &= \int_{D_r} (|\nabla v|^2 - |\nabla u|^2) d\mu + 2 \int_{\partial D_r} (v - u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds \\ &= I(v, D_r) - I(u, D_r) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{S(z_k, r)} (v - u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds \\ &= I(v, D_r) - I(u, D_r) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k (b_k - a_k) + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we calculated the integral $\int_{S(z_k, r)} (v - u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}$ a similar way as in the proof of lemma 2.1 and used the Green's identity

$$\int_{D_r} (\nabla u \cdot \nabla v) d\mu = - \int_{\partial D_r} v \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds,$$

where n is the inner normal vector. $\square$

The quantity

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k a_k = \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^m \delta_k \delta_l g_\Gamma(z_l, z_k, D)$$

we call the reduced modulus and denote it by $M(D, \Gamma, Z, \Delta)$. According to lemma 2.1

$$M(D, \Gamma, Z, \Delta) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \left(I(u, D_r) - \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \delta_k^2 \right) \lambda_n r^{2-n} \right).$$

Theorem 2.3 *Let sets D, Γ , collections $Z = \{z_k\}_{k=1}^m, \Delta = \{\delta_k\}_{k=1}^m$, be as in the definition of the reduced modulus $M = M(D, \Gamma, Z, \Delta)$, $u(z)$ be the potential function for D, Γ, Z, Δ , and let $D_i \subset D$ be pairwise non-overlapping subdomains of D , $\Gamma_i, Z_i = \{z_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}, \Delta_i = \{\delta_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}$, be from the definition of the reduced moduli $M_i = M(D_i, \Gamma_i, Z_i, \Delta_i)$, $u_i(z)$ be the potential function for $D_i, \Gamma_i, Z_i, \Delta_i, i = 1, \dots, p$. Assume that the following conditions are fulfilled:*

- 1) $(D \cap \partial D_i) \subset \Gamma_i, i = 1, \dots, p$;
- 2) $\Gamma \subset (\bigcup_{i=1}^p \Gamma_i) \cup [\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^p \overline{D}_i)]$;
- 3) $Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^p Z_i$, that is each point $z_k \in Z$ coincides with some point $z_{ij} \in Z_i$ for $k = k(i, j)$ and vice versa;
- 4) $\delta_k = \delta_{ij}$ for $k = k(i, j)$.

Then the inequality

$$M \geq \sum_{i=1}^p M_i + \sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, D_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^p M_i$$

holds.

Proof. Consider the function

$$v(z) = \begin{cases} u_i(z), & z \in D_i, \\ 0, & z \in D \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^p D_i). \end{cases}$$

The condition 1) guarantees that the function $v(z)$ is continuous in $\overline{D} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m \{z_k\}$. From the conditions 2) and 3) it follows that $v(z) = 0$ for $z \in \Gamma$ and in a neighbourhood of $z_k, k = 1, \dots, m$, there is the expansion (5). Applying lemma 2.2, we get

$$I(v - u, D) = I(v, D_r) - I(u, D_r) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^p \delta_k (b_k - a_k) + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0, \quad (7)$$

here a_k and b_k from (4) and (5) respectively. By lemma 2.1

$$I(v, D_r) = \lambda_n r^{2-n} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p M_i + o(1) = \lambda_n r^{2-n} \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p M_i + o(1),$$

$$I(u, D_r) = \lambda_n r^{2-n} \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k^2 + M + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0,$$

taking into account 3), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k(b_k - a_k) = \sum_{i=1}^p M_i - M.$$

Substituting the obtained correlations in (7), we see that the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, D_i) \leq I(v - u, D) = M - \sum_{i=1}^p M_i + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0,$$

is true. Theorem is proved. $\square$

Theorem 2.4 *Let sets D , Γ , collections $Z = \{z_k\}_{k=1}^m$, $\Delta = \{\delta_k\}_{k=1}^m$, be as in the definition of the reduced modulus $M := M(D, \Gamma, Z, \Delta)$, $u(z)$ be the potential function for D, Γ, Z, Δ , and let $D_i \subset D$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, be pairwise non-overlapping domains, Γ_i , $Z_i = \{z_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}$, $\Delta_i = \{\delta_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}$, be from the definition of the reduced moduli $M_i = M(D_i, \Gamma_i, Z_i, \Delta_i)$, $u_i(z)$ be the potential function for $D_i, \Gamma_i, Z_i, \Delta_i$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. Assume that $\Gamma_i \subset \Gamma$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, $Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^m Z_i$, (that is each point $z_k \in Z$ coincides with some point $z_{ij} \in Z_i$ for $k = k(i, j)$ and vice versa), $\delta_k = \delta_{ij}$. Then the inequality*

$$\sum_{i=1}^p M_i \geq M + \sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, D_i) \geq M$$

holds.

Proof. The function u is admissible for D_i , $i = 1, \dots, p$. Let b_k be constants from the expansion of the function u in a neighbourhood of z_k , $b_{ij} = b_k$ if $k = k(i, j)$. Applying lemmata 2.1 and 2.2 with the potential functions u_k

for D_k we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\delta_{ij})^2 r^{2-n} \lambda_n + \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} a_{ij} + o(1) = \sum_{i=1}^p I(u_i, (D_i)_r) = \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^p \left(I(u, (D_i)_r) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} (b_{ij} - a_{ij}) - I(u - u_i, (D_i)_r) \right) + o(1) \\
& \leq I(u, D_r) - \sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, (D_i)_r) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} (b_{ij} - a_{ij}) + o(1) \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\delta_{ij})^2 r^{2-n} \lambda_n + \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} b_{ij} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} (b_{ij} - a_{ij}) \\
& \quad - \sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, (D_i)_r) + o(1), \quad r \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} b_{ij} \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} a_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, D_i)$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{i=1}^p I(u - u_i, D_i) + M(D, \Gamma, Z, \Delta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p M(D_i, \Gamma_i, Z_i, \Delta_i).$$

Here we used the fact that the function $u - u_i$ has no singularity in D_i . $\square$

Denote by $r(D_l, x_l) = r(D_l, x_l, \partial D)$ the harmonic radius. Directly from theorem 2.3 we get theorem 2 of the paper [5]

Corollary 2.5 *For any non-overlapping domains $D_l \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, points $x_l \in D_l$ and real numbers δ_l , $l = 1, \dots, m$ the inequality*

$$-\sum_{l=1}^m \delta_l^2 r(D_l, x_l)^{2-n} \leq \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{\substack{p=1 \\ p \neq l}}^m \delta_l \delta_p |x_l - x_p|^{2-n}$$

holds true.

Proof. The Green's function of the ball $B(0, \rho)$ is

$$\lambda_n \left(|x - x_0|^{2-n} - \left| \frac{|x_0|x}{\rho} - \frac{\rho x_0}{|x_0|} \right|^{2-n} \right).$$

Denote by $D_l(\rho)$ the intersection $D_l \cap B(0, \rho)$. By theorem 2.3

$$M(\rho) \geq \sum_{l=1}^m M_l(\rho),$$

where $M(\rho)$ is the modulus of the ball $B(0, \rho)$, the collections $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^m$, $\Delta = \{\delta_l\}_{l=1}^m$, and $\Gamma = \partial B$,

$$M_l(\rho) = -\delta_l^2 r(D_l(\rho), x_l)^{2-n} \lambda_n.$$

It is sufficient to take a limit as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 imply for $p = 1$ monotonicity of the quadratic form

$$\sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_\Gamma(z_l, z_p, D)$$

under extension of a domain. Following [2] we will say that a domain $\tilde{D}$ is obtained by extending a domain D across a part of its boundary $\gamma \subset \partial D$ if $D \subset \tilde{D}$ and $(\partial D) \cap \tilde{D}$ lies in γ .

Corollary 2.6 *If $\tilde{D}$ is obtained by extending D across Γ , $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset (\Gamma \cup (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D}))$, then for any real numbers δ_l and points $z_l \in D$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_{\tilde{\Gamma}}(z_l, z_p, \tilde{D}) &\geq \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_\Gamma(z_l, z_p, D) + I(u - \tilde{u}, D) \\ &\geq \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_\Gamma(z_l, z_p, D). \end{aligned}$$

If $\tilde{D}$ is obtained by extending D across the part of $(\partial D) \setminus \Gamma$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_{\tilde{\Gamma}}(z_l, z_p, \tilde{D}) &\leq \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_\Gamma(z_l, z_p, D) - I(u - \tilde{u}, D) \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_l \delta_p g_\Gamma(z_l, z_p, D), \end{aligned}$$

here u and $\tilde{u}$ are the potential functions for D , Γ , $Z = \{z_l\}_{l=1}^m$, $\Delta = \{\delta_l\}_{l=1}^m$ and $\tilde{D}$, $\tilde{\Gamma}$, $Z = \{z_l\}_{l=1}^m$, $\Delta = \{\delta_l\}_{l=1}^m$, respectively.

In [3] the notion of the Robin radius

$$r(D, z_0, \Gamma) = \exp \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} (g_D(z, z_0, \Gamma) + \log |z - z_0|)$$

was introduced. This quantity generalized the notion of the conformal radius. An analogue of Kufarev's theorem (see [8]) for non-overlapping domains D_1, D_2 lying in the unit disk U under the condition $((\partial D_k) \cap U) \subset \Gamma_k \subset \partial D_k$, $a_k \in D_k$, $k = 1, 2$ is the inequality

$$r(D_1, a_1, \Gamma_1) r(D_2, a_2, \Gamma_2) \leq |a_2 - a_1|^2 \left[1 - \left| \frac{a_2 - a_1}{1 - \overline{a_1} a_2} \right|^2 \right]^{-1}.$$

By setting in theorem 2.3 $p = 2$, $\Gamma = \emptyset$, we obtain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ the following inequality.

Corollary 2.7 *Let D_1 and D_2 be non-overlapping and lie in the ball $U = B(0, 1)$, $a_k \in D_k$, $(\partial D_k) \cap U \subset \Gamma_k \subset \partial D_k$, $k = 1, 2$. Then*

$$-\lambda_n r(D_1, a_1, \Gamma_1)^{2-n} - \lambda_n r(D_2, a_2, \Gamma_2)^{2-n} \leq M(U, \emptyset, \{a_1, a_2\}, \{1, -1\}). \quad (8)$$

To calculate $M(U, \emptyset, \{a_1, a_2\}, \{1, -1\})$ we need to know the Neumann function of the unit ball. Note that it is a quite complicated problem in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, for $n = 3$ (see [13])

$$g_\emptyset(x, y, U) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|} + \frac{|y|}{|x|y|^2 - y|} - \log \left| 1 - (x, y) + \frac{|x|y|^2 - y|}{|y|} \right| \right).$$

In [13] there is an analytic view of $g_\emptyset(D, x, y)$ for $n = 4, 5$. So, for $n = 3$ the inequality (8) has the following form

$$\begin{aligned} -r(D_1, a_1, \Gamma_1)^{-1} - r(D_2, a_2, \Gamma_2)^{-1} &\leq -\frac{2}{|a_1 - a_2|} - \frac{2|a_2|}{|a_1|a_2|^2 - a_2|} \\ &+ 2 \log \left| 1 - (a_1, a_2) + \frac{|a_1|a_2|^2 - a_2|}{|a_2|} \right| + \frac{1}{1 - |a_1|^2} + \frac{1}{1 - |a_2|^2} \\ &\quad - \log(4(1 - |a_1|^2)(1 - |a_2|^2)). \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by the Russian Science Foundation under grant 14-11-00022.

References

- [1] V.N. Dubinin, *Condenser capacities and symmetrization in geometric function theory*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2014.
- [2] V.N. Dubinin and N.V. Eyrikh, Some applications of generalized condensers in the theory of analytic functions, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **133**(6) (2006), 1634-1647.

- [3] V.N. Dubinin and D.A. Kirillova, On extremal decomposition problems, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **157(4)** (2009), 573-583.
- [4] V.N. Dubinin and L.V. Kovalev, The reduced module of the complex sphere, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **105(4)** (2001), 2165-2179.
- [5] V.N. Dubinin and E.G. Prilepkina, Extremal decomposition of spatial domains, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **105(4)** (2001), 2180-2189.
- [6] E.G. Emel'yanov, On problems on the extremal decomposition, *Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov Leningradskogo Otdeleniya Matematicheskogo Instituta Imeni V. A. Steklova*, **154** (1986), 76-89.
- [7] J. Hersch, Transplantation harmonique, transplantation par modules, et théoremes isoperimetriques, *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, **44** (1969), 354-366.
- [8] P.P. Kufarev, On the question of conformal mappings of complementary domains, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **73** (1950), 881-884.
- [9] G.V. Kuz'mina, Methods of geometric function theory. I, II, *St. Petersburg Mathematical Journal*, **9(3)** (1998), 455-507; **9(5)** (1998), 889-930.
- [10] B.E. Levitskii, The reduced p-module and the inner p-harmonic radius, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **316** (1991), 812-815.
- [11] Ch. Pommerenke and A. Vasil'ev, Angular derivatives of bounded univalent functions and extremal partions of the unit disk, *Pacific J. Math.*, **206(2)** (2002), 425-450.
- [12] E.G. Prilepkina, On composition principles for reduced moduli, *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, **52(6)** (2011), 1079-1091.
- [13] M.A. Sadybekov and B.T. Torebek and B.Kh. Turmetov, Representation of Green's function of the Neumann problem for a multi-dimensional ball, *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17476933.2015.1064402>
- [14] A.Yu. Solynin, Modules and extremal metric problems, *St. Petersburg Mathematical Journal*, **11(1)** (2000), 165.